REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 11, 25, 35, 49, and 59 are amended. It should be appreciated that dependent Claims 11, 35, and 59 were amended for consistency with amended Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Claims 4, 8, 10, 28, 32, 34, 52, 56, and 58 had been previously canceled. Hence, Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 11-26, 31, 33, 35-50, 55, 57, and 59-72 are pending in the application. The rejections of all of the pending claims are traversed for at least the reasons discussed below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 1, 25, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Specifically, the use of second set of one or more other frames which can display unrequested content was deemed not found in the Specification. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 25, and 49. The amendment to the Claims is discussed in detail hereinbelow. It is submitted that the amendment to Claims 1, 25, and 49 deem the rejection to be moot. Hence, removal of the rejection and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS—35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 13, 16-19, 25, 26, 31, 37, 40-43, 49, 50, 55, 61, 62, and 65-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,761 ("Landsman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6.687,746 ("Shuster").

Neither Landsman nor Shuster, alone or in combination, disclose

the claimed porthole engine

Present Claim 1 and the other independent claims further clarify the claimed subject matter. Support for the amendment to the claims can be found in the Specification in the section entitled, "EVENT SEQUENCES IN FRAME-WRAPPING: RECEIVING THE REQUESTED WEB PAGE AND THE UNREQUESTED INFORMATION." Thus, present Claim 1 and the other independent claims recite "said porthole engine responding to said initial request by generating frame data that defines at least a first frame and at least a second frame, wherein said requested content is to be displayed as an embedded item in said first frame and wherein unrequested content is to be displayed as an embedded item in said second frame." As well, present Claim 1 and the other independent claims recite "causing, by the frame data, the client, responsive to said sent frame data, to decode the sent frame data, including decoding tags for embedded items, said embedded items including the requested content and unrequested content; and causing, by the frame data, the client, responsive to causing client to decode frame data, to send to the porthole engine the initial request for the requested content as an embedded item and the unrequested content as an embedded item; and causing, by the frame data, causes the client to display said requested content and said unrequested content to appear as embedded items on a single display screen of said client".

In stark contrast, Landsman is concerned with a web browser requesting to fetch a web page, receiving the fetched page, and downloading an ad controller agent for the purpose of addressing unreliable user counts and erroneous ad charges (see Fig. 1B and col. 7, lines 54-67 through col. 8, lines 1-40.)

Shuster discloses in "…response to the receipt of the frameset 74, the user computer 12 requests the Uniform Resource Locator's ("URL's") for the various frames contained within the frameset 74 from the provider computer 14."

However, neither of the cited references teach or fairly suggest, alone or in combination, the claimed features as recited hereinabove.

For these reasons, Claim 1, the other dependent claims, and the respective dependent claims are deemed to be in condition for allowance. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

(b) Claims 9, 11, 12, 33, 35, 36, 57, 59, and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,393 ("Eilbott").

Claims 9, 11, 12, 33, 35, 36, 57, 59, and 60 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Eilbott does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 9, 11, 12, 33, 35, 36, 57, 59, and 60. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

(c) Claims 14, 15, 38, 39, 63, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,653 ("Ackermann").

Claims 14, 15, 38, 39, 63, and 64 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Ackermann does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 14, 15, 38, 39, 63, and 64. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

(d) Claims 20, 44, and 68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,873 ("Underwood").

Claims 20, 44, and 68 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Underwood does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 20, 44, and 68. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

(e) Claims 21-23, 45-47, and 69-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,042 ("Markus").

Claims 21-23, 45-47, and 69-71 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Markus does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 21-23, 45-47, and 69-71. Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

(f) Claims 24, 48, and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Landsman and Shuster and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,810 ("Shapiro").

Claims 24, 48, and 72 are dependent upon and thus include all features of independent Claims 1, 25, and 49, respectively. Shapiro does not cure the deficiencies of Landsman and Shuster with respect to the features of Claims 1, 25, and 49. Therefore, the combination of the

three references does not present a prima facie case of unpatentability of Claims 24, 48, and 72.

Removal of the rejection and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: October 2, 2007

/JuliaAThomas#52283/
Julia A. Thomas
Reg. No. 52,283

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 754-1451
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076